

REMARKS

Claims 1-25 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1-25 have been rejected. Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 11, 22 and 25 have been amended. These amendments are respectfully asserted to not introduce new matter (see, e.g., the specification at page 12, line 14 through page 15, line 11, and page 18, line 17 through page 19, line 11), and their entry is respectfully requested.

I. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4, 6-17, 19 and 21-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Venkateswar (US 5,721,622). Claims 1-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Sandstrom (US 6,618,185). These rejections are overcome for the exemplary reasons set forth below.

A cited prior art reference anticipates the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102 only if every element of a claimed invention is identically shown in that single reference, arranged as they are in the claims. MPEP § 2131; *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 832, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566, 1567 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Anticipation is only shown where each and every limitation of the claimed invention is found in a single cited prior art reference. MPEP § 2131; *In re Donohue*, 766 F.2d 531, 534, 226 U.S.P.Q. 619, 621 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Exemplary independent Claim 22 as currently amended recites “*wherein the area is an area corresponding to the portion of the image and selected to bear the portion of the image, wherein the portion of the image is defined by a set of data, and wherein, for each said transfer, the associated set of light modulation elements uses said set of data to transfer the portion of the image onto the area.*” Similar limitations can be found in independent Claims 1, 7 and 11 as currently amended. The exemplary claim feature quoted above has not been found to be taught in Venkateswar or Sandstrom. Accordingly, the next Office Action

should either point out where this feature is taught in Venkateswar and/or Sandstrom, or withdraw the corresponding claim rejections. As demonstrated above, the § 102 rejections of Claims 1-25 are overcome, and withdrawal of those rejections is respectfully requested.

II. CONCLUSION

As a result of the foregoing, all Claims in the Application are now believed to be in condition for allowance, and an early allowance of such Claims is respectfully requested.

If any issues arise, or if the Examiner has any suggestions for expediting allowance of this Application, the Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number or email address indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

KEN A. NISHIMURA et al

Dated: 3/9/2006

By Holly L. Rudnick
Holly L. Rudnick
Registration No. 43,065

Garlick, Harrison & Markison, LLP
P.O. Box 670007
Dallas, Texas 75367
(Direct) (214) 387-8097
(Fax) (214) 387-7949
(Email hrudnick@texaspatents.com)